

JEFFREY D. WOHL (Cal. State Bar No. 96838)
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP
55 Second Street, 24th Floor
San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: (415) 856-7000
Facsimile: (415) 856-7100
jeffwohl@paulhastings.com

STEPHEN H. HARRIS (Cal. State Bar No. 184608)
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP
515 South Flower Street, 25th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 683-6000
Facsimile: (213) 627-0705
stephenharris@paulhastings.com

Attorneys for Defendant
Los Alamos National Security, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL AND
TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES, CWA
LOCAL 9119, AFL-CIO; RICHARD
MONTROYA; CATHERINE CHAPMAN;
THOMAS MARKS; and MANUEL
TRUJILLO,

Plaintiffs/Petitioners,

vs.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA; LOS
ALAMOS NATIONAL SECURITY, LLC;
and DOES 1 TO 40, inclusive,

Defendants/Respondents

No. C-06-03326-SBA

**STIPULATION AND ORDER SETTING
BRIEFING AND HEARING SCHEDULE FOR
PARTIES' CROSS-MOTIONS AND RESETTING
CASE MANAGEMENT DATES**

STIPULATION

Plaintiffs University Professional and Technical Employees, CWA Local 9119, AFL-CIO; Richard Montoya; Catherine Chapman; Thomas Marks; and Manual Trujillo, and defendants The Regents of the University of California and Los Alamos National Security, LLC, acting through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. This action was commenced in California Superior Court, Alameda County (the “Superior Court”), on April 18, 2006, and removed to this Court on May 19, 2006.

2. Defendants’ response to plaintiffs’ complaint was due on June 19, 2006.

3. On May 31, 2006, plaintiffs e-filed a First Amended Complaint.

4. Plaintiffs intend to move to remand this action to the Superior Court. Defendants intend to bring motions to dismiss the First Amended Complaint.

5. After conferring, the parties wish to coordinate the scheduling of their respective motions to avoid conflicts with the Court’s hearing availability and their calendars.

6. Accordingly, the parties have agreed and respectfully request that the Court approve the following briefing and hearing schedule for their respective motions:

July 28, 2006: Plaintiffs to e-file their motion to remand.

Defendants to e-file their motions to dismiss (the due date for defendants’ response to plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint would be extended to this date)

August 25, 2006: Parties to e-file their oppositions to the pending motions

September 12, 2006: Parties to e-file their replies in support of their respective motions.

September 26, 2006: Hearing on parties’ respective motions (1:00 p.m.)

7. Because these motions should be decided before the parties embark on case management proceedings, the parties further have agreed and respectfully request that the Court reset the case management dates previously set in this action as follows:

///

///

///

November 2, 2006: Last day for parties to meet and confer regarding initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR processes, and discovery; last day for parties to file ADR certification and either stipulation to ADR process or notice of need for ADR telephone conference

November 22, 2006: Last day for parties to complete their initial disclosures or state objections in Rule 26(f) report, file case management statement and Rule 26(f) report

December 4, 2006: Initial case management conference (3:00 p.m.)

8. By entering into this stipulation, the parties do not waive any objection, claim, or defense they may have.

Dated: June ___, 2006.

PETER W. SALTZMAN
ARTHUR A. KRANTZ
LEONARD CARDER, LLP

By: _____
Arthur A. Krantz
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
University Professional and Technical Employees,
CWA Local 9119, AFL-CIO; Richard Montoya;
Catherine Chapman; Thomas Marks; and
Manual Trujillo

Dated: June ___, 2006.

MARY C. OPPERDAHL
REED SMITH LLP

By: _____
Mary C. Oppedahl
Attorneys for Defendant
The Regents of the University of California

1
2 Dated: June ____, 2006.

JEFFREY D. WOHL
STEPHEN H. HARRIS
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP

3
4 By: _____

Jeffrey D. Wohl
Attorneys for Defendant
Los Alamos National Security, Inc.

ORDER

Based on the parties' stipulation, and good cause appearing therefor,

IT IS ORDERED that the Court adopts the following briefing and hearing schedule for the parties' planned motions to remand and to dismiss, and resets case management proceedings, as follows:

July 28, 2006: Plaintiffs to e-file their motion to remand.

Defendants to e-file their motions to dismiss (the due date for defendants' response to plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint is hereby extended to this date)

August 25, 2006: Parties to e-file their oppositions to the pending motions

September 12, 2006: Parties to e-file their replies in support of their respective motions.

September 26, 2006: Hearing on parties' respective motions (1:00 p.m.)

November 2, 2006: Last day for parties to meet and confer regarding initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR processes, and discovery; last day for parties to file ADR certification and either stipulation to ADR process or notice of need for ADR telephone conference

November 22, 2006: Last day for parties to complete their initial disclosures or state objections in Rule 26(f) report, file case management statement and Rule 26(f) report

December 4, 2006: Initial case management conference set for **2:30 p.m.**, via telephone. Plaintiff's counsel is to set up the conference call with all the parties on the line and call chambers at (510) 637-3559.

Dated: June 12, 2006.


Saundra Brown Armstrong
United States District Judge